



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/317,714	05/24/1999	PETER B. KESSLER	4278	9469

7590 05/21/2004

Wagner, Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

LAO, SUE X

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

12

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/317,714

Applicant(s)

KESSLER ET AL.

Examiner

S. Lao

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,11,21,24-30,32-37,39,40 and 42-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 8,9,21,24,32-35 and 40 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11,25,26,28-30,36,37 and 42-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 27 and 39 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 8, 9, 11, 21, 24-30, 32-37, 39, 40, 42-50 are pending. This action is in response to the amendment filed 3/1/2004. Applicant has amended claims 8, 9, 11, 21, 24, 25, 36, 39, canceled claims 1-7, 10, 12-20, 22, 23, 31, 38, 41 and added claims 42-50.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 8, 9, 21, 24, 32-35 and 40 are allowed.
4. Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
5. Claims 27, 39 are objected to as being dependent upon respective rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims.
6. Claims 45, 49, 50 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
8. Claims 11, 42-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites "the interface repository loader" in line 12, "the specified interface definition language file" in lines 14-15 and "the specified prefix naming context" in lines 15-16. There is insufficient antecedent basis for each of these limitations in the claim.

Claim 42 recites "the prefix naming context" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "the specified prefix naming context", as best understood and as it appears to be.

Claim 43 recites "of claim 43" in line 1, which is an inappropriate dependent. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "of claim 42", as best understood and as it appears to be.

Claim 44 recites "the prefix naming context" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "the specified prefix naming context", as best understood and as it appears to be.

Claims 46-48 recite "the prefix naming context" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the respective claims. For the purpose of art rejection, it is interpreted as "the specified prefix naming context", as best understood and as it appears to be.

9. Claims 25, 26, 28-30, 36, 37 and 42-44, 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over OMG (Interface Repository, OMG TC Document 94-11-7) in view of Nelson et al (U S Pat. 5,577,252) and SOM (SOMObjects Developer Toolkit Users Guide, version 2.0, pages 7-1 to 7-16).

As to claim 25, OMG teaches providing type support for multiple type definitions (type checking, page 10, lines 3-4), comprising: an interface repository (interface repository) including: a repository naming context (repository name space, page 14, section 2.5.3, lines 3-4). OMG further teaches naming context (module name space) subordinate to the repository naming context (page 16, lines 7-9) for at least one interface definition language declaration (objects in interface repository correspond to IDL statements). See sections 2.2, page 13, 2nd, 4th para.s. OMG further teaches the

prefix naming context being adapted to resolve names subordinate to the repository naming context (resolve relative to context, page 17, 2nd para.).

While OMG manages naming contexts within the repository (module name space, page 16, lines 7-9; contexts, page 37, line 4), OMG does not teach that the naming contexts includes a prefix naming context serving as a root naming context.

Nelson teaches a name context/space (naming services, fig. 5), which includes a subordinate prefix naming context (naming context 'C' in "C/J" for invoking object 'J'), to serve as a root naming context during name resolution (resolve name context 'C', then resolve name 'J' within 'C'). See col. 5, lines 34-45; col. 6, lines 23-58. Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a prefix naming context into the interface repository naming context of OMG. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of OMG and Nelson because this would provide secure object access (Nelson, col. 6, line 60 - col. 7, line 44) which, to one of ordinary skill in the art, would have been highly desirable when an ORB has access to multiple interface repositories as in the case of OMG (OMG, page 11, 1st para.).

OMG as modified further teaches an interface repository loader (OMG, repository operations/pragmas) that accepts as input parameters a specified interface definition language file containing at least one interface definition language declaration (OMG, install interface into repositories, page 11, 2nd and last para.s) and installs the at least one interface definition language declaration (OMG, install interface into repositories, page 11, 2nd and last para.s) in a naming context (page 51, sections 3.3.2).

OMG as modified does not teach that the input parameters includes a specified prefix name.

SOM teaches an interface repository loader (SOM compiler/emitter) which accepts as input parameters an interface declaration and a specified prefix name (c:\myfiles\l) such that the interface declaration (newcls.ir) will be installed in the name context indicated by the prefix name (page 7-2, section 7.2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include into the input parameter and the specified prefix name into OMG as modified. In so doing, additional type checking could have been provided with the use of the -u flag of the SOM compiler.

As to claim 26, OMG teaches at least one naming context (module name space) defined by an interface definition object (interface object). See discussion of claim 1. The combination of OMG and Nelson would have resulted in at least one naming context subordinate to the prefix naming context.

As to claims 28-30, placing the prefix naming context immediately subordinate to the repository naming context (a root naming context) would have been obvious because each name resolution requires context information. Using a prefix object to define a naming context such as a prefix naming context would have been obvious in view of the fact that each element (repository, modules, interfaces) in the OMG interface repository is implemented with an object. Further, like other typical hierarchical structures, a naming context typically includes leave and non-leave nodes. The same would have been applied to the prefix naming context.

As to claim 36, it is a method claim of claim 25, thus note claim 25 for discussion.

As to claim 37, note claim 26 for discussion.

As to claim 42, it is covered by claim 25, and it is noted that an IDL root context / root IDL naming context of claim 42 is equivalently claimed as serving as a root naming context of claim 25.

As to claim 43, OMG as modified provides multiple sub naming contexts. Therefore, it would have been obvious to apply the operations regarding one sub naming context to another / second set of IDL file and second prefix naming context.

As to claims 44, 46-48, note claims 26, 28-30, respectively, for discussions.

10. Applicant's arguments filed 3/1/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 25, applicant argued that a specified prefix name is not met by "c:\myfiles\" and the interface declaration is not met by "newcls.ir" (remarks, page 13, last paragraph). The examiner respectfully disagrees. The SOM "newcls.ir" contains IDL declarations created from "newcls.idl" and its naming context is described by "c:\myfiles\" portion of the IR name. See page 7-2, section 7.2., Further, as disclosed, applicant's prefix naming contexts are used to differentiate environments (deployment

vs. development) and are expressed in directory-subdirectory format, similar to SOM. See application as filed, page 15, lines 9-17.

Applicant further argued that OMG, Nelson and SOM does not teach an interface repository loader that, as claimed. (remarks, paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14). The examiner respectfully disagrees. An interface repository loader that, as claimed, is met by the combination of OMG, Nelson and SOM, as discussed in detail in the rejection of claim 25.

Regarding claim 42-50, applicant argued that in Nelson, context D serves as the root naming context (remarks, page 14, 3rd paragraph). The examiner's response is that in Nelson, the subordinate prefix naming context (naming context 'C' in "C/J" for invoking object 'J') servers/acts as a root naming context during name resolution (resolve name context 'C', then resolve name 'J' within 'C'). See col. 5, lines 34-45; col. 6, lines 23-58. Therefore, Nelson meets "the prefix naming context acts as the root IDL naming context" as claimed (claim 42, lines 8-9). Further, as disclosed, applicant's prefix naming context is an IDL root context only for the interface definition objects subordinates to it. See application as filed, page 13, lines 19-22.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sue Lao whose telephone number is (703) 305-9657. A voice mail service is also available at this number. The examiner's supervisor, SPE Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305 9678. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, from 9AM to 5PM. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872 9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Sue Lao 
May 15, 2004